

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 28, 29, 31, and 32 have been amended, and claim 33 has been added. Claims 2-4, 7-16, 28, 29, and 31-33 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this or any other application.

Claims 7, 3, 4, 8 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenji (Japanese Patent No. 5690568) in view of Rostoker (U.S. Patent No. 5,811,320). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, an imaging device having a “frame, support structure, and semiconductor chip encapsulated in a transparent material.” Kenji relates to a photoelectric transducer device having a molded lens and a mask area to restrict incoming light. Rostoker relates to methods of etching optical elements in association with photosensitive elements. (Abstract).

The subject matter of claim 7 would not have been obvious over Kenji in view of Rostoker. Specifically, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Kenji and Rostoker, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an imaging device having a “frame, support structure, and semiconductor chip encapsulated in a transparent material,” as recited in claim 7. For at least these reasons, claim 7 is allowable over Kenji in view of Rostoker.

Claims 3, 4, 8, and 32 depend from claim 7, and are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7, and on their own merit. Specifically, Kenji and Rostoker, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claims 3, 4, 8, and 32.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenji in view of Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,053,298). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Park discloses a color filter and manufacturing method thereof. (Abstract). Kenji and Park, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an imaging device having a “frame, support structure, and semiconductor chip encapsulated in a transparent material,” as recited in claim 7. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 7, and for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 10 are allowable over Kenji in view of Park. In addition, Kenji and Park, whether considered alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claims 9 and 10.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenji in view of Anderton (U.S. Patent No. 5,596,228). The rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested.

Anderton relates to an apparatus for cooling charge-coupled device imaging systems. (Abstract). Kenji and Anderton, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an imaging device having a “frame, support structure, and semiconductor chip encapsulated in a transparent material,” as recited in claim 7. Claim 2 depends from claim 7, and for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 2 is allowable over Kenji in view of Anderton. In addition, Kenji and Anderton, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claim 2.

Claims 11-13, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker in view of Kenji. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, an imaging system having “first, second and third semiconductor devices on respective frames, each of said frames having a support structure,” and “each of said frame, support structure, and respective semiconductor device is encapsulated in respective first, second and third packages,” wherein the packages are formed of transparent material.

Kenji and Rostoker, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a “frame, support structure, and respective semiconductor device is encapsulated in

respective first, second and third packages,” wherein the packages are formed of transparent material, as recited in claim 11. For at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable over Kenji in view of Rostoker.

Claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 11, and are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11, and on their own merit. Specifically, Kenji and Rostoker, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claims 12, 13, 15, and 16.

Claims 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenji in view of Shibata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,827,118). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, an imaging device comprising a “housing having a cavity and a bottom surface,” “a semiconductor chip located within [the] cavity of [the] housing,” and the “semiconductor chip being encapsulated in a transparent material, wherein said transparent material has an uppermost surface substantially planar to an uppermost surface of said housing.”

Kenji and Shibata, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an imaging device comprising a “housing having a cavity and a bottom surface,” “a semiconductor chip located within [the] cavity of [the] housing,” and the “semiconductor chip being encapsulated in a transparent material, wherein said transparent material has an uppermost surface substantially planar to an uppermost surface of said housing.” For at least these reasons, claim 28 is allowable over Kenji in view of Shibata.

Claims 29, 31, and 32 depend from claim 28, and are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 28, and on their own merit. Specifically, Kenji and Shibata, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claims 29, 31, and 32.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker in view of Park. The rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 14 ultimately depends from claim 11. As discussed above with respect to claim 11, Kenji and Rostoker, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a "frame, support structure, and a respective semiconductor device is encapsulated in respective first, second and third packages," wherein the packages are formed of transparent material, as recited by claim 11. Similarly, the combination of Rostoker and Park also fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 11. Claim 14 is allowable over Rostoker in view of Park for at least these reasons. In addition, Rostoker and Park, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claim 14.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: August 13, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 785-9700
Attorney for Applicant